

## MERCATOR:

O R,

## Commerce Retrieved,

B E I N G

CONSIDERATIONS on the State of the *British* Trade, &c.

From Tuesday, January 26. to Thursday, January 28. 1713.

*The Necessity of Repeating Things in the Mercator.**The Opposers go on Affirming and Affirming, tho' never so evidently Answer'd and Confuted.**Arguments in the Mercator forgotten, and never mentioned by the Opposers.**A Quotation out of the very First Paper, Mercat. No. 1.**King William and Queen Mary brought to testify, that they believed the Trade to France Advantageous.**If we lost by the French Trade, Why were the French the first to Tax it? If they gain'd, Why did they Tax it at all?*

**I**T is very unpleasant to write the same thing twice over; but when a Set of Men are not ashamed to assert a Falshood twice, nay many times over, for the Deluding and Abusing the People, the *MERCATOR* hopes, he may be excused repeating the Truth twice over, to Undeceive them.

It would be impossible for these People to support their Opposition to the Arguments used in behalf of the Trade to France, if they were not furnished with this peculiar brazen Talent or Qualification, (viz.) That taking no Notice of the clearest and irresistible Confutations of their Assertions, they can nevertheless assert the same things over and over again, as if they had never been Answered at all.

This is exemplified in a late Assertion printed over and over by their Scribblers in these Words, *If France had granted us the Tariff of 1664 for our Woollen Manufactures?* And in another, *The Mercator has often told us of the Tariff of 1664. God knows we have little of that:* And the like.

With what Face do these Men speak to the World? Have we not the Tariff of 1664 for all our Woollen Manufactures, two sorts excepted; and as the *MERCATOR* laid down from the beginning, that we were to have the said Tariff of 1664, so the said Exceptions were always fully published with it, and the Tariff and Exceptions always mentioned together, as may appear *MERCATOR* No. 4. in these Words: "All our Woollen Manufactures Exported from England to France are reduced to the Old Duties payable by the Tariff of 1664. except Broad Cloth and Serges, which are to pay, as by the Tariff of 1699. (that also being capable of being moderated by Commissioners) thus:

"Broad Cloth, which from the Year 1667. paid 80 Livres, will now pay only 55 Livres.

"Mill'd Serges, which paid 15 Livres, now 11 Livres.

"All other Woollen Goods pay after the Tariff of 1664. Ratins are Rated as Broad Cloth, but of them we Export none, therefore they are not mentioned.

And after this, the *MERCATOR*, No. 6. was wholly printed to obviate and effectually put to Silence this absurd Novelty of our not having the Tariff of 1664 Granted us to all our Woollen Goods, the Exception of Cloths, Ratins and Serges only reserved, in which *MERCATOR* the Clause of the Specification annexed to the Treaty is also printed at large; to which the *MERCATOR* refers for proof.

Yet after this, have these Men the Face to affirm in print, that we are not by this Treaty to enjoy the benefit of the Tariff of 1664 for our Woollen Manufactures.

If they will quibble, and say it is not enjoyed for our Woollen Manufacture, because of the Exception of Broad Cloth and Serges, we'll be content to see them trifle in that manner: But, in the meantime, let them make good their Assertion or Blush, and confess they speak falsely, knowing it to be so: Let them tell us, what parts of our Woollen Manufactures are not admitted into France by the present Treaty, upon the Tariff of 1664; if they are more, than what the *MERCATOR* mentioned, then they are Right, and need not be ashamed of it; if they are no more, and if all our Woollen Goods except Broad-Cloth, Serges, and Ratins, which we send none of, are admitted on the Tariff of 1664, as the *MERCATOR* has always publicly said, then from what Principle dare these Men say, that we are not to enjoy the Tariff of 1664 for our Woollen Manufactures?

But this is the way of these Men, and these are the Arguments they use; and this puts us in mind of some other things, which the *MERCATOR* said so long ago, and they have never yet taken the least Notice of, so that they seem loth they should be Remember'd, and which for that Reason may bear a Repetition. These are two Evidences, which confirm what the *MERCATOR* has said, of the Trade to France being advantageous to England in former times, and were brought in justification of the general Assertion, in the very first *MERCATOR* that was written. The Words are these:

The



The next thing is the Evidence: For the Weight of which, this Paper is an Appeal to the World. First let us call personal Evidence, and then proceed to Evidence of Fact. Our Personal Evidence will be very good; no less than two Kings and a Queen.

The King of France, in the first place, has tacitly own'd it, by raising his Customs, and laying Prohibitions upon our Trade to put a Check to the Import of our Goods, that his own Subjects might not be impoverish'd, and England enrich'd at their Expence.

The Government of England, in the next place, have always complain'd of these Interruptions of Trade, as injurious to the English Nation, and done to their Prejudice.

For Proof of this, take the Words of the Declaration of War against France 1 William and Mary, (which is the first Authority to be quoted in this Paper) where tho' there seems to be some Contradiction in the Argument, yet the Words confirm the thing now proposed, viz. *That the Trade from England to France was to the Advantage of England.* One Reason, why we declare War against the French King, is there founded upon his Burthening and Interrupting our Trade to France: The Words are these; *Forbidding the Importation of a great part of the Product and Manufactures of our Kingdom, and Imposing Exorbitant Customs upon the rest, are sufficient Evidences of his Design to destroy the Trade, on which the Wealth and Safety of this Nation so much depends.* Vide Declar. of War, 1689.

It will hardly be allow'd, that the late King would have made this a Reason for declaring War against France, if he had believed, that the Trade carried on with France had been (as has been reported) carried on at more than a Million Sterling per Ann. to the Loss of this Nation. It will as hardly obtain, that the French King would be the Aggressor in Interrupting a Commerce, by which his own People were Gainers from the English at more than a Million Sterling per Ann. The contrary, rather, is strongly implied; viz. That the King of England esteem'd the Interruption of the Commerce with France an Injury and a Loss to England, and therefore resent'd it; and the French King esteem'd the Trade from England a Loss to his own Subjects in general, and therefore loaded it with Duties and Customs, and interrupted it with Prohibitions.

What Answer have these Men given to this, Noise and Clamour excepted? What indeed can they say to it? What ridiculous Language must they make King William and Queen Mary speak in their Declaration of War? telling the French King of *his Design to destroy the Trade, on which the Wealth and Safety of this Nation so much depend, &c.* What! Does our Wealth and Safety depend upon a Trade, that we lose Money by! Nay, that we lose a Million a Year by! Is this making the Declaration speak Sense? Or had King William no better a Pretence than this for making War against France? No better an Argument to bring, than that the King of France had gone about to destroy a Trade, which, if we had been in our Senses, we should have

destroy'd long ago, and which, we ought to have thought our selves infinitely obliged to him for destroy-ing? A Trade, by which we lost a Million a Year, and which must in time carry all our Money out of the Nation! One of these two Things must necessarily follow in this Case, Either these Men have Imposed upon us, or that Declaration of War was the most ridiculous of the kind, that ever was published.

But it is no new thing for these Men to blunder in such a gross manner as this; for, they can argue against Demonstration with the greatest Assurance imaginable.

As to the Argument of the French being the First, who laid Taxes upon the Trade, and that the English were very slow and backward to Retaliate by laying Taxes on theirs; the *MERCATOR* having stated that already, No. 103. leaves them to answer it, when they think fit; summing the whole Argument up in these Two Questions.

If England had believed, they had always lost by the French Trade, why WERE NOT they the first to load the Trade with Duties and Impositions to prevent that Loss?

If France had believed they were Gainers by the Trade, why WERE they the first, that loaded the Trade with Duties and Impositions to ruine their own Gain?

The World would be mighty glad to see these Questions Answer'd.

In the mean time let them see the daily Specimens of our Trade to France, tho' now loaded with such Duties, as almost quite prevent our Trade in our own Woollen Manufactures; What then would it be, if that Trade were open?

### From the Custom-House.

Exported to France in Three Days, (viz.)  
Jan. 18, 19, 20.

800 l. wt. Woollen Cloth  
30 Castors  
15 Stuffs  
15 Spanish Cloths  
42 l. Wrought Iron  
14 l. Wrought Brass  
12130 l. Cotton Wooll  
466 Gal. Canary  
2564 Glass Bottles  
15184 l. Virginia Tobacco  
30 Quar. Meal  
12 Quar. Wheat  
\* 80 Quar. Barley  
25 C. Lead-shot  
10 Ton Fustick  
4 Ton 17 C. Brasiletto  
34 Ton 3 C. Logwood



LONDON: Printed for BENJ. TOOKE, at the Temple-Gate; and  
JOHN BARBER, on Lambeth-Hill. (Price 3 Half-pence.)